India

FOR THE

No. 79. New Series.
No. 173. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 7, 1899.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d | By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News ...	1
Indians and the Civil Service ...	4
The "Home Charges," by E. H. Pickersgill, M.P. ...	5
New Light on Rousseau ...	6
Our London Letter ...	7
Chronicle of the Week ...	8
Notes from Bombay ...	9
The High Court Judges ...	9
The Indian Senior Wrangler: Congratulations from Fergusson College ...	10
How Ranjitsinhji lost a Kingdom...	10
Indian Affairs in Parliament: Special Report ...	10
Advertisements ...	12

**** An Index with Title page to Volume XI of* India *(January to June, 1899) is in the press. A copy will be forwarded gratis and post free to any Subscriber on application to the Manager.*

NOTES AND NEWS.

We understand that a meeting of the Indian Parliamentary Committee will be held on Monday next (July 10) to consider a memorial to the Secretary of State for India regarding the separation of judicial from executive functions in the Indian administration, and to arrange for the debate on the Indian Budget with reference to the amendment of which Sir W. Wedderburn has given notice in the following terms:—

> That under the existing procedure the superintending authority of Parliament over Indian affairs is not effectively exercised; that the Salary of the Secretary of State for India should be placed on the Estimates; that the debate on the Indian Budget should be appointed for an earlier day in the Session; and that, with a view to the more effectual discharge by this House of its existing duty to the unrepresented Indian taxpayer, the East India accounts should each year be referred to a Select Committee, with instructions to report on any special features deserving the attention of the House.

We learn with pleasure that the members of the advanced section of the Radical party will ballot for a place for this amendment.

Our readers will remember that, in the following question to Lord G. Hamilton, Sir W. Wedderburn drew attention to the grievances of the Sea Post Office employés between Bombay and Aden:—

> To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that since the cheap rate of postage to India heavy additional work had fallen upon the sorters of the Sea Post Office between Bombay and Aden:
>
> Whether in March last the number of bags in a single mail exceeded 1,000 whereas five years ago the average was barely half that number:
>
> Whether the sorters had usually to work from 6.30 a.m. to 11 p.m.:
>
> And, whether he would cause such reasonable additions to be made to the staff as would prevent excessive pressure and unduly long hours of work in a tropical climate.

Lord G. Hamilton promised to communicate with the Government of India on the subject, and we are glad to learn that the matter is being enquired into, with good hope that the grievances complained of will be redressed.

We print in another column the full text of the congratulatory Address to Mr. R. P. Paranjpye from Fergusson College, Poona, on the unique occasion of his Senior Wranglership. The College may well be proud of its student, not only for the academic distinction he has associated with it, but still more for the "magnificent spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion" to it, which he has manifested. The Address also properly acknowledges the national significance of Mr. Paranjpye's triumph: "the whole country has naturally reason to be proud of you." We trust that "the elevating example" will indeed prove to be "a standing source of high inspiration" to his countrymen. For it is only by what they show themselves capable of *doing* that the Indians can impress effectively the minds of Englishmen. It comes to be a work-a-day question of quiet, steady, well-planned exertion by every man in his own sphere of labour. Applause is easy. Let us now see who has grit for performance.

The reports of attempts to assassinate the Amír of Afghanistan may be quite true, but, at the same time, there need not be any haste in accepting them without confirmation. Likely enough, an Afghan fired at the Amír, and shot a general instead; likely enough, some scoundrel attempted to bribe a cook to poison the Amír. The most significant element in the stories seems to be a certain coincidence of results: that the incompetent shooter "succeeded in making his escape to Russian territory," and that the rascally briber "at once found an asylum in Russian Central Asia." If the attitude of the Russian local officials is to be inferred from this, then they would seem to have taken up the new *rôle* of playing England's game. After all the whole business may be mere irresponsible intrigue, if not a series of lies. We trust the Amír may be long preserved, for his honourable conduct and his strong rule are the best guarantees of peace in Central Asia.

"Guerilla" writes in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* on "the North-West Frontier." He is much frightened by the advance of Russia, and considers that our frontier policy should have for its object the checking of Russia's schemes, especially in Persia and the Persian Gulf. While thus supporting a policy of adventure, he is not inclined to any frittering away of the resources of the Empire in contests with frontier tribes, nor does he minimise the errors of the recent operations. He speaks of "the disgraceful abandonment of the Khyber Rifles," and declares that "Tirah is but the history of a failure, redeemed by the gallant pluck and endurance of the fighting ranks and their officers." Between our frontier and its neighbours, Persia and Afghanistan, there remain independent only a few mountain tribes. "Unpleasant experience has warned us to leave them as far as possible alone." This would be common sense were it not that the reason for this moderation is not found in the poverty of India and the difficult problems of Indian Government, but in the necessity of being ready for greater undertakings farther afield. Lord Curzon is reminded of what he wrote some years ago, that in the Persian Gulf England claims "that no hostile political influence shall introduce its discordant features upon the scene," and he is called upon to carry out as Viceroy the policy he advocated as an irresponsible writer. Finally, "Guerilla," sighing for still further adventures, gives us the comforting assurance of the increasing "importance" of the North-East Frontier.

But if "Guerilla" does not spare the short-comings of the Indian Government, he is still more severe on those of certain persons called "Little Englanders," whose want of spirit is contrasted with the enlightened patriotism of Russia. Within our territory lines of rail progress but slowly:—

> Russia on the other hand does not leave these needs unfulfilled. The roads of Russia proper may be the veriest quagmires, and the masses of the people kept in ignorance, but the great enterprises of the Empire, the Trans-Caspian, Trans-Siberian, and Trans-Persian railways, are never lost to view. The treasuries may be empty, but the policy of the Empire, viz., its steady expansion, is never allowed to flag for want of funds.

But there are men so dead to true patriotism as to prefer good roads and education at home to railways beyond the frontier:—

> The wealthiest empire of the world, Great Britain, with its dependency of "India," is guided in its expenditure by other principles, and sets aside, on the plea of paucity of funds, measures of frontier defence, territorial aggrandisement, and colonial and commercial enterprise, which, from an Imperial point of view, it would seem needful to undertake without delay. Little Englanders may clamour and protest, but empires will expand. The Press of India has of late developed a strong taint of "Little Englandism."

It is scarcely to be imagined that there are men who would not willingly submit to quagmires and ignorance for the sake of territorial aggrandisement.

The order of the Government of the South African Republic for the removal of British Indians to locations by July 1 has not been found capable of execution, and a new order has been issued. Those who had asked for an extension of time are granted three months; those who had obtained leases before 1889 will be allowed to remain till their leases expire; and those who had fixed property before the law was passed may remain so long as they are owners of the property. There are some special cases reserved for further consideration. The muddle is as bad as ever, and the business of the British Indians is still in disorganisation, without any definite prospect of settlement. This comes of the raw haste of the Transvaal Government, and of the mischievous action of British diplomacy in staking the Bloemfontein Conference on the Uitlander franchise alone, with the certainty, if not with the definite intention, of failure.

Last week was a great week for India in the cricket field. Prince Ranjitsinhji made 198 at the Oval; and an Anglo-Indian boy, A. E. J. Collins, beat the record with 628 not out in a House match at Clifton College. Collins took six hours and fifty minutes to do this. He is only fourteen years old, and was born in India. His father, a member of the Indian Civil Service, is no longer alive. Stoddart, who held the record till now, has sent his young rival a bat.

The *Pioneer* devotes a long article to the paper which Mr. O'Dwyer recently read at the Society of Arts on agrarian conditions under English and Native rule. Mr. O'Dwyer confined his remarks to the places he was himself acquainted with, two small States of Rajputana and certain districts of the Punjab, and on the whole inclined to the belief that the conditions were better in the Native States. This is traversed by the *Pioneer*, which also joins issue on the statement that in the British districts the land is under-assessed. Sir James Lyall, who takes the same view as the *Pioneer*, points out that, though we have been continually reducing the percentage of assets taken, we have at the same time been increasing our means of gaining an accurate knowledge of the assets. Our contemporary is somewhat indignant with Mr. O'Dwyer for even raising the question whether the Indians are happier in the Native States or in British territory.

In the recent riots in Southern India which have attracted so much attention, one incident has afforded a curious confirmation of the views so often put forward in the Indian and Anglo-Indian Press on the inconvenience, not to say danger, of the constant transfers of officials. According to the *Madras Mail*, Mr. Scott, District Magistrate of Tinnevelly, after suppressing the first disturbances round Sikavasi, was allowed to go on three months' privilege leave. Mr. Bedford, who succeeded him, had been for four years in the Finance Department. Surely, without in any way reflecting on Mr. Bedford's conduct or capacity, the *Madras Mail* is right in calling it "absolute folly" for the Government to allow a change of magistrates at such a critical moment.

Indian public opinion remains still on the side of the men in the G. I. P. Railway strike. The action of the Company in handing the men dismissal certificates though they had voluntarily resigned, and in making difficulties about paying them up to the date of their being relieved from service, has intensified this feeling. The conduct of the Government in lending military signallers to the Company does not recommend itself to the *Mahratta*, but is defended by the *Times of India*, which quotes as an instance the use of the military to supply the places of the recalcitrant postmen in the recent strike at Paris. It is quite true that this was received with approval by the people of that city, whose sympathies were not with the strikers; and for that very reason the case differs from the one under consideration, for in Bombay public opinion supports the men against the Company, who are carrying on their campaign with the aid of soldiers and at the ultimate expense of the tax payers, who have guaranteed the Company's dividend.

The *Englishman* complains that in Calcutta there are in plague cases many deliberate attempts to conceal the cause of death from fear of official interference, and, in view of the mildness of the regulations, it thinks that this fear must be due to the false statements of agitators. It is quite true that the regulations require neither the segregation of the sick nor the isolation of their friends, and that those who are stricken can be attended at their own homes, and are not forced to go into hospital. But readers of INDIA are aware that in matters of plague, precept and practice do not always go together. In Bombay it will be remembered, a patient of Dr. Blaney's was removed from his home in spite of the regulations and against the doctor's wish. Again, the harsh, or at least rough, methods of inspection on the railways have not been forgotten. However excellent the arrangements in Calcutta, the people cannot be expected at once to forget all that has been done in India in other places or in the earlier days of the present outbreak. And over-zealous officials are still a possibility. With all this, is it surprising that even the mildest plague regulations beget a certain dread? Is it necessary to call in agitators, when the mere history of plague prevention in the last few years is enough? Is anything to be blamed except the original determination of the Government to disregard the public opinion of India? Those who make a late repentance cannot complain if their new professions are received with some distrust.

The *Mahratta*, while welcoming General Protheroe's military enquiry into the Rangoon outrage, justly points out that "the real needs of the case cannot be met by only ordering more prosecutions in this case." Our contemporary proceeds :—

> It may be safely said that regimental discipline in India has become very loose; and that is the real cause why we have unfortunately so often to witness the spectacle of British soldiers preying upon society as if they were so many wild beasts murdering and outraging innocent and unprotected subjects of her Majesty. But the military party in India has, in these respects, been almost as over-predominant as in France, and all suggestions as to making discipline more strict and effective against soldiers have been negatived on the ground of military prestige. But the Government of India cannot, we think, afford to treat this matter with indifference any longer. For the brutal conduct of soldiers and the apparent indifference of Government in checking it have begun to poison the fountains of loyal feeling in the hearts of the people.

Though one or two of the points may be somewhat roundly expressed, there can be no doubt that the *Mahratta* here fully represents the general Indian opinion, and that its remarks deserve the most serious consideration of the authorities.

Admittedly, it is a sore point to have to pay up to an income-tax collector. But, for all that, Mr. Kaps was grievously in the wrong when he abused a Naib Tahsildar and a police officer, who in the discharge of their irksome duty presented him with a warrant at his master's shop in Mussoorie. Nay, he even assaulted the Naib Tahsildar. As a proper consequence, the District Magistrate sentenced the recalcitrant and pugnacious Kaps to a week's simple imprisonment. The accompanying remarks of the Magistrate are tolerably significant :

> In delivering the court's judgment Mr. Streatfield remarked that Native Government servants were quite sufficiently afraid of Europeans to be only too glad to get out of proceeding to extremities with them if they saw any reasonable excuse. It was extremely difficult, he said, for a Native force of police to manage a European station like Mussoorie; that Europeans seemed to consider that no respect was due to the police and other Native officials; and so when a definite case of assault like this occurred it was necessary not to pass it over with a mere fine.

Kaps appealed to the Sessions Judge, and was admitted to bail. We trust the Sessions Judge will exhibit no less grit than Mr. Streatfield. The majesty of the law cannot tolerate such contumacious and arrogant conduct.

The new rules as to the salaries and pensions of the judges of the high courts in India, which were despatched to the Government of India on April 27, have only now (July 5) been communicated to the Press in England. We print them in another column. The Government of India desired to discriminate between barrister judges sent out from England and all other judges, so as to grant to the former pensions graduated according to length of service. This principle, for which there is much to be said, has been overruled by the Secretary of State, who has reduced the length of service qualifying for pension from 14 to 11½ years in all cases, and compulsorily retires all judges at 60. New judges recruited from England will henceforth, with rare exceptions, be well on the sunny side of 50. The judges are—or rather ought to be—well worth

the higher salaries assigned. The high courts are the most respected institutions in the country; but they are respected more for their honesty than for their legal capacity. What is urgently needed is some revised system of appointment. It is invidious to particularise, much as one has been lately tempted to do so. But Lord George Hamilton ought to know that he could readily obtain far superior men for the money.

In England, we are not unfamiliar with non-judicial occupants of a seat on the Bench. In India, in some parts at least, the practice has become a scandal. The *Pioneer* has opened its columns to correspondence on the subject of court inspectors on the bench, and a correspondent very justly asks, "Why should any witness or party to a case receive a seat on the bench?" He proceeds:

> The practice is diametrically opposed to the spirit, if not the letter, of English law, and must inevitably lead to the impression in the minds of the opposite party that the evidence or arguments of the favoured person will carry irresistible weight with the court. It is the practice of many, if not most courts, to give a chair on the bench to civil surgeons, district superintendents of police, magistrates, etc., and some courts think that it is part of the British constitution that every European summoned as a witness should have a seat on the bench. The whole custom is a relic of barbarism, and the sooner it is swept away the better for the purity and impartiality of the administration of the law, and for the respect and confidence with which it is regarded by the public.

The practice is most improper, and the comment of the correspondent will commend itself to all fair-minded readers. The scales of justice ought not only to be held even, but to appear manifestly to be held even, be the parties who they may.

In the June number of the *Educational Review* (Madras), the Allahabad High Court is taken to task for refusing to admit Miss Cornelia Sorabji as a lady vakil. There is no question of Miss Sorabji's qualifications:—

> To many, however, it seems but in the fitness of things that because ladies are not permitted to practise as barristers in England, the same must hold good in India. This continual reference to England as the standard of fitness for India has worked mischief in more than one direction. In India, as all are aware, there are many propertied women to whom the purdah system is an insuperable barrier to their seeking legal advice. In England, on the other hand, women have no scruples about consulting their family or other lawyer in person. One important reason, therefore, for the admission of women to the profession of vakils in India has no place in England. We sympathise in particular with Miss Cornelia Sorabji who has devoted years to hard study in the law; and, in the interests of female education in India, as well as in the interests of the many women who would eagerly have availed themselves of the services of a lady vakil, we cannot but regret the action of the Allahabad High Court.

Now that the authorized print of Mr. Eardley Norton's Presidential Address to the eighth Indian Provincial Conference at Coimbatore is before us, it will not be too late to recognize its judicious breadth and practical soundness. The courageous plain-speaking of the following passage appeals to Anglo-Indians and Natives both:—

> To me it seems that Englishmen [in India] are bound, as well by considerations of political expediency as by higher considerations of human sympathy and help, to do what in us lies to assist you in your struggles to the light. I recognize, with gratitude and pride, that those struggles are the outcome—and the legitimate and necessary outcome—of the educational advantages which England has placed so bountifully at your disposal. I recognize that it is we who have guided your political criticisms, and supplied you with the thought upon which those criticisms rest. You are fulfilling England's mission in trying to fulfil your own. It may be—I do not say it is—that some of your criticisms are crude, that some of your ambitions are misplaced, that some of your methods are unreasonable. But even if all this is true, the very fact that you are trying to better your position by the partial application of Western methods to the systems of the East is full of hope to those who, like myself, regard all such manifestations of intellectual activity as indications of muncipal virility and of political promise. It is expedient that Englishmen should associate themselves with your assemblies, for, although in the majority of your demands they may have no direct personal or selfish stake, there are few matters in which Indian interests are concerned which do not indirectly, yet materially, affect the position which Englishmen occupy in India as units of a general whole.

"To me," said Mr. Norton, "it is, I admit, a matter of infinite regret, if not of despair, that, in all the many years I have been in India, my fellow-countrymen seem never to have risen to a realisation of the true sublimity of all that is writ beneath their physical presence in this country."

Mr. Norton also had a word in season for the caustic critics of Indian aspirations, which deserves to be pondered well in this country:—

> To criticism no one can object. But it is distressing to read and listen to the criticism which is generally applied to the declarations of your wants. I have no hesitation in saying that the greater portion of that criticism is grossly unfair, and is not based on any honest acquaintance with your own utterances. Far be it from me to say, or even to suggest, that your views are always sound. But you are entitled to have your speeches read, your views weighed, your ambitions analysed, as you state them yourselves and not as your critics state them for you.

The restrained remarks on topics connected with the administration of justice—topics with which Mr. Norton is specially fitted to deal—are very well worth the most thoughtful attention.

An Anglo-Indian correspondent writes:—"Last Saturday our leading journal opened its column of 'Political Notes' with a sentence somewhat similar to the following: 'The Finance and Commerce Department of the Planet Saturn has just presented to Parliament its Financial Statement for 1899-1900.' Now such revelation by the Saturnians of their financial affairs might be welcomed as a sweet boon by our hereditary legislators to fill up their spare time, but the House of Commons might regard such additional Blue-book as somewhat of a bore. However, on reading the next sentence of the *Times'* Notes the vision is dispersed, for it begins: 'In his introduction Sir James Westland,' etc., etc., and this brings us to earth again. The plain prose of the matter is (*a*) that the last day of June had come before the Indian Financial Statement, with the proceedings thereon, could be laid before Parliament, in belated obedience to the statutory requirement; and (*b*) that the writer of the *Times*' 'Political Notes' seemed to be unaware that all the chief figures and facts of the statement had been placed before its readers so long since as March in a copious telegram, together with a leading article summarising and, so to speak, disposing of the whole subject. Not only the *Times*, but other large dailies, did their duty by the Financial Statement three months ago, while all these 'proceedings,' which the leading journal re-discovered a week ago, were fully reported and sent over here in March in the weekly editions of the Bombay and other Anglo-Indian daily papers. As to the latter, the full account of Sir James Westland's final Budget, most Anglo-Indians have them in reach, and are more or less familiar with their contents."

"Probably, however, the readers of the *Times*, having too many other things to think of—how to smash the Transvaal, for instance—will have forgotten all about Indian finance for the three years 1898-1900, seeing that the subject presented itself as new to the 'Political Notes' writer. So it is well that the chief figures of that huge subject have been afresh brought to the notice of the British public. And it is only just to say that as a summary and *précis* those notes in the *Times* of Saturday, July 1, are so well done that it is worth while to give this precise reference—whether the writer be a Saturnian or one of Du Maurier's Martians. One word as to the tardy presentation to Parliament of these big financial accounts, which were, in effect, finally disposed of at Calcutta nearly four months since. As the paper had to be set up and printed there, it was agreed to have a sufficient number of copies worked off to serve for presentation as the Act required to both Houses of Parliament, and it was said this would save time. But now members receive their copies later than ever. Why and how is this? And how late will the ensuing 'Explanatory Memorandum' be in making its appearance?"

So far our esteemed correspondent. But one of his nails may be driven deeper. Lord George Hamilton stated in the House (June 22, INDIA, p. 330) that "the financial statement has just been received from India, so that it will be impossible to take it before the usual time—namely about the end of the Session." Now, many arguments have at various times been offered for the postponement of the debate on the Indian Budget. But surely this is the first time that we have been told that, because the financial statement is received here before June 22, therefore it cannot be discussed till the middle of August! Besides, why was the statement not received earlier—say three months earlier? Our correspondent demonstrates by dates and facts the unintelligible slackness of the Government.

INDIANS AND THE CIVIL SERVICE.

WHEN the Queen in her famous Proclamation of forty years ago, on assuming the Government of India, promised that all races and peoples throughout her Indian Empire should be equal before the law, there were not wanting simple and loyal souls who took her words literally and believed that now at last the Indians might have some share in the Government of their own country. And some share, indeed, they have been allowed to gain. Those with energy to cross the sea, with resources to live for years in a distant land, and with ability to compete in a foreign language with those to whom that language is native, were given the chance of entering the Imperial, or as it was formerly called the Covenanted, Civil Service. But even then, even when they had victoriously surmounted these difficulties, they found the highest positions still closed against them. It seemed, indeed, that the spirit, if not the letter, of the Queen's proclamation was broken in two ways. The Indians could not be said to compete on equal terms when they could only enter into competition in England, thousands of miles from home; and the Indian civilians, even when they had forced open the door, the entry through which was made so difficult, found that, as regarded the great prizes of the service, a fiat of exclusion had gone forth against them. So glaring did the injustice of the first of these breaches of the Queen's promise appear, that at last the House of Commons, never very ready to interest itself in Indian affairs, passed a resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations in England and India. But the Indians were to be taught that, in the affairs of their country, a resolution of the House of Commons could be treated with as much indifference as a proclamation in the name of her Majesty the Queen. The Anglo-Indians had their own views on the subject and they prevailed over Queen and Commons, and the hopes of the Indians were once more dashed to the ground.

Considering, then, what a powerful effect Anglo-Indian views have had in this controversy, it is interesting to read a defence of the position of the opponents of simultaneous examinations which appears in the July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* from the pen of "a former Indian Civilian." The arguments he adduces are three: (1) the unfitness of Indians to stand alone; (2) the jealousy and distrust existing between Indians of different race or creed; (3) and most important of all, the injustice to the Indian taxpayer of admitting Indians to so highly paid and privileged a service. We will consider each of these in turn, reserving the one on which he lays most stress for the last.

It is pleasant to note that the "retired Indian civilian" does not descend to the wholesale abuse of Indian character sometimes indulged in by men of less experience. He is, for the matter of that, too satisfied of the truth of his position, or, as an unfriendly hand might put it, too wise in his own conceit, to think it necessary to paint the Indian all black. Thus he bears testimony to the Indian's intellectual powers :—

> By many people who ought to know him well the Indian native often seems to be criticised in an ignorant and prejudiced spirit. The whole body of Natives, or special creeds or races, are often described as liars, rogues, simpletons, schoolboys with portentous memories, weak, cunning, treacherous cowards. Such judgments always strike me as highly unjust. Natives, as compared with Europeans, seem to me to display a much higher average of clear intellectual power, an extraordinary faculty of acquiring languages, and unlimited power of work. A muddle-headed Native is never encountered.

And he goes on :—

> Morally he is a more difficult subject to estimate. His standard of honour is different from that of Europeans, but I am not sure that it is lower. There are as many faithful and brave men in India as in any part of the world.

But he insists that the Indian has been downtrodden so long that he cannot be trusted to stand alone. And he ends his argument with the appeal, "Let him remain for the present a subordinate under supervision. Do not endanger our rule in India by opening to him the posts still reserved for the Covenanted Civil Service." But Indian civilians have already filled posts in which they had to stand alone. When and where have they endangered British rule in India? It is quite true that the Indian ought to be emancipated by degrees. But every civilian has to serve before he commands—has to pass years as a subordinate before he reaches a position of great authority. What is this but gradual emancipation? How is he more likely to obtain a knowledge of the way to govern men than by working under those who are already skilled in that difficult art? And what is more likely to make him turn such an opportunity to good advantage and to develop all his powers than the certainty that the highest posts in the service are open to him if he deserves them? And what is more likely to encourage all that is servile in a man's nature than the knowledge that he is one of a race held unworthy of great responsibilities, and shut off by an impassable barrier from the highest functions in his own land?

But if those Indians who have succeeded in entering the Imperial Civil Service have furnished no ground for the charge that they cannot be trusted to act independently, no more have they excited religious and racial animosity. That such animosities exist is, indeed, a blemish on English rule, which has done so little to diminish them, even when it has not looked on these divisions with complacency. But it requires more than a letter to the *Times* to prove that Indians would rather cut themselves off from all share in the government of their country than suffer themselves to be governed by those of their countrymen who profess a different religion. What Hindu objects to a Mahometan sitting in the high courts? What Mahometan complains of a Hindu receiving a judgeship? No doubt some Mahometans have been brought to think that they are at present unduly handicapped, a view which has received much Anglo-Indian encouragement; but between this view, whether justified or not, and a desire for the exclusion of all Indians, themselves among the number, from the Imperial Civil Service there is a wide difference. Nothing would be more likely to make them reconsider their position than so drastic a proposal.

But the chief argument of the paper is that the Covenanted Civil Service is so highly paid that it is an injustice to the Indian taxpayer to admit Indians thereto. No doubt competent Indians, and competent Englishmen as well, could be got cheaper. But if the Indian does his work well, it is a pecuniary advantage to India that he should be employed instead of an Englishman. It is in vain that our "former Indian Civilian" recounts all the ruinous glories of long leave and early retirement, of splendid pay and heavy pensions; they only make the advantage of employing Indians greater. Supposing the Indian Civilian had every privilege and emolument of his European colleague, India would still be the richer by diminishing the drain to Europe which now places her in the position of a tributary country. The Indian Civilian would not need to transmit any of his pay to England to educate or provide for his children. He would not usually pass his furloughs out of India. He would spend his pension in the country. In every way there would be a material advantage to India. If, as is the case with Indian Judges of the High Court, he served for less, the gain would of course be still greater, but in every case there would be a gain. The heaviest gain of all—a gain to England no less than to India—would lie in the frank fulfilment of her Majesty's Proclamation, so dear in the eyes of her Indian subjects.

But these considerations bring us to a still graver weakness in the chain of the argument as put forward in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. The writer of the paper admits that reform is necessary and, indeed, proposes some drastic changes, but he considers his opponents' position as if all change was impossible. And yet many of the difficulties he raises, like the financial one, might be met by far less serious alterations of the present system than those which he suggests. Two of his proposals may be mentioned: the entire exclusion of Indians from the "Covenanted" Civil Service, and the reduction of its numbers to such an extent that only ten recruits would be needed each year instead of sixty or seventy. The latter, coming as it does from a writer so strongly Anglo-Indian, bears eloquent testimony to the impossibility of maintaining the present expensive system of government; while the former bears testimony equally eloquent to the failure to keep Indians out of the Service by the difficulties thrown in their way. The proposal to reduce the number of the Imperial Civil Service in so great a proportion must mean the increasing employment of Indians in subordinate posts, while there is a general consensus of opinion that the appointment of one Indian to a post of real dignity and power has more effect in attaching the people to our rule than the opening of many minor offices to natives of India. Mr. Morison, of Aligarh College, is a strong opponent of the Congress, and

is in touch with Mahometan opinion, yet there was no point more strongly urged than this in his recent book. Nor could any method be devised more certain to foster sluggishness and incapacity in subordinate officials than to shut them off for ever from all hope of great preferment. And it is something that the great traditions of the Covenanted Civil Service should be handed on through all changes and should in the end become the common property of Indian and European officials alike. To exclude Indians from the chief positions because they could be got to fill those positions at a lower rate than Englishmen is surely the height of absurdity. To exclude them because they are necessarily unfit is at once to disregard the good service that many Indians have already done and to confess that English rule has failed in the political education of the country. Burke was right in saying that you cannot draw up an indictment against a nation; nor can you assert that out of two-hundred-and-fifty millions of men, none can be found who are fit to bear rule. If the privileges of the Service are greater than are necessary to attract the best Indians, let them be revised; if the numbers are too great for the country to support, let them be reduced; but do not make the very costliness of the the government a reason for keeping it exclusively in the hands of aliens—for that is to make it more expensive at present and to cut off all hope of economy in the future. It is to cheat the hopes we have raised and to give the lie to our most solemn promises. It is above all to admit that in its loftier aspirations our rule has been a failure.

THE "HOME CHARGES."

By E. H. Pickersgill, M.P.

A QUESTION in the House of Commons the other day reminded the world of the existence of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, but Lord George Hamilton's reply, considered in the light of experience, was hardly calculated to encourage hopes of an early publication of their report. It appears, however, that "two of the three portions of which the draft report is composed have already been circulated, or are in the act of being circulated, for the approval of the Commission." We are not informed as to which part of the report has not reached even this stage of development, but I rather presume that it is the part which deals with the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested. Meanwhile the annual parliamentary paper, entitled "Home Accounts of the Government of India," which has just been issued for the current year, contains some materials which ought not to pass without notice. I turn first to the report of the Auditor upon the accounts, which is submitted to Parliament in pursuance of the 52nd Section of the Government of India Act, 1858. This interesting document draws attention to numerous instances in which, according to the judgment of the Auditor, injustice has been done to India. But the final decision rests with the Secretary of State in Council, and, whereas a man of spirit at the India Office might be expected to champion in the Cabinet of the United Kingdom the interests of the Indian people, Lord George Hamilton seems always to give the Indian case away. The most flagrant instance relates to the expenses attending the employment of Indian troops at Suakin. It will be remembered that the question whether these expenses should be entirely defrayed from Imperial sources was warmly debated in the House of Commons, but eventually the Government, by means of their mechanical majority, carried a Resolution which was substantially as follows:—

> That the ordinary pay of the troops, which would have been charged upon the resources of India, if such troops had remained in that country, shall continue to be so chargeable.

But the Government of India, in addition to bearing the *ordinary* pay of the troops, has credited the Imperial Government with the amount of certain estimated savings in respect of compensation allowances for dearness of provisions during the famine to which these troops would have been entitled if they had been employed in India! The Auditor represented that this extra charge upon India was not justified by the resolution of the House of Commons, but he was overruled by the Secretary of State in Council. Whatever may be said in support of the resolution passed in Parliament there can be only one opinion as to the almost incredible meanness involved in using the terrible visitation of the famine itself as the ground for the imposition of an additional burden upon the Indian people. These accounts also include two items of £322 and £349 respectively, being a moiety of the cost of entertaining Persian Envoys on the occasion of her Majesty's Diamond Jubilee. The Auditor expressed a doubt whether the revenues of India could be correctly appropriated to this purpose, but we are informed that "the charge was, on full consideration, accepted by the Secretary of State for India in Council."

I turn next to the relations between the India Office and the War Office. In the first place the Auditor directs attention to the inconvenience experienced through claims on the War Office being left long outstanding. This is a very old complaint, for I find that more than twenty years ago a Parliamentary Committee on Public Accounts reported in strong terms respecting similar delays on the part of the War Office in settling Indian claims. But I pass on to two specific instances of what in other relations of life would be called sharp practice. For some years now the Indian troop transport services have been entirely carried out by hired transports, and India bears the whole charge for the hire, fitting, manning, docking, etc., of the ships, as well as the direct and indirect administrative charges incurred by the Transport Department of the Admiralty. But this service, the entire cost of which is defrayed from Indian revenues, is utilised for effecting the Mediterranean reliefs, including regiments, such as the Guards, which will never go on to India, and involving the messing at Indian charge of British regiments proceeding to Imperial stations. Thus, in the opinion of the Auditor, "the revenues of India have been appropriated to other purposes than those of the Government of India." It may be added that under the Troop Service, which preceded the present system, the Admiralty bore a considerable charge for pensions of seamen, and charged nothing to India in the shape of rent for dock accommodation nor in the shape of profit on the work performed.

Secondly, in accordance with a long-standing arrangement between the two Departments, the War Office are under obligation to supply India with ordnance stores at cost price, plus a Departmental percentage. But the Auditor points out that the War Office has charged India for rifles at a rate of £4 10s. 6d. each, whereas it appears from the published accounts of the Ordnance Factories that these weapons were produced at a cost of £2 14s. 5d. each. And he adds that, in order to reduce his objections to a definite issue, he has disallowed £1 per arm. But I have little doubt that the Secretary of State for India in Council, "upon full consideration," will throw over the Auditor. This officer further objects to

> the continued use in 1897-8 of the 1893 Vocabulary of War Office prices for stores, on the ground that those prices for some articles, especially explosives, are much in excess of the average cost of recent production, and do not therefore fulfil the conditions of the agreement on which stores are supplied to India.

The constant friction between the Indian authorities and the War Office emphasises the importance of the extension of the system of manufacturing in India as against importing from England. Upon this subject Colonel Wace, Inspector-General of Ordnance, Bengal, gave very interesting evidence before the Royal Commission. He pointed out that the manufacture of steel for all artillery projectiles has been satisfactorily introduced in the Cossipore factory in recent years, and that there is no reason why the requirements of gun mountings and carriages should not be similarly met if proper plant and establishment were given. He also produced a table showing the cost of some of the principal stores manufactured in the factories in Bengal, as compared with the supply from home. From this list it appears that 12-pr. shrapnel shell (for example) are manufactured in India at a cost of Rs. 760 per 100, as against Rs. 813 if imported from England; and that a saddle made at Cawnpore only costs Rs. 9, whereas a saddle made in England would cost Rs. 24. Colonel Wace was pressed by some of the Commissioners as to whether the saddle made at Cawnpore would last as long as the English saddle, and he replied that he thought it would. He added that during the last few years a comparative trial of Indian leather and English leather had been carried out by an expert, most exhaustive tests of the strength of the two leathers under different conditions being applied, and the result was in favour of the leather made at Cawnpore. It

is interesting to note that Colonel Wace has a very high opinion of the Indian artisan, whose work upon gauging tools, for instance, which have to be turned to the thousandth of an inch, he considers to be in all respects equal to the same class of work in this country. I may add that the manufacture of Government stores in India is gradually extending. The net capital of the factories in land, buildings, and machinery increased from 59½ lakhs of rupees to 71½ lakhs in the seven years from 1884 to 1891, and a further increase has since taken place; and during the same period the value of the outturn of the factories in Bengal increased from 48½ lakhs of rupees to 95¼ lakhs, or nearly double. The following comparative table of expenditure on ordnance stores manufactured in India and England respectively will show at a glance something of the progress which has been made in this direction:—

Years.	Expenditure in India.	Expenditure in England.
	Rx.	£
1889-1890	631,667	253,504
1890-1891	715,984	720,814
1891-1892	724,316	830,247
1892-1893	790,195	583,819
1893-1894	830,074	547,202

To return to the Home accounts just published, I may quote in conclusion, without comment, some interesting and significant items:—

	£	s.	d.
Passage to India of chaplains on appointment	245	0	0
Cost of maintenance of lunatics at Broadmoor and elsewhere	5,683	0	0
Pay, passage, etc., of medical officers and lady nurses in connexion with the plague	11,247	4	8
Expenses incurred in connexion with the Imperial Institute	1,900	0	0
Expenses attending the reproduction of the Ajanta Cave paintings	494	4	5
Cost of Insignia of the Order of the "Star of India," etc.	4,516	3	6
Moiety of expenditure in connexion with the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure	1,408	12	5

NEW LIGHT ON ROUSSEAU.

"MAN is born free and everywhere he is in chains." Most people are familiar with the opening words of Rousseau's "Contrat Social," and every undergraduate could write an essay to prove their falsity. No golden age of perfect freedom and perfect innocence ever existed except in dreams of the poets. If we think of men in the days before they had banded themselves together in tribes and cities and societies, we must think of them as savages struggling each with his neighbour in a fierce fight for existence. The picture of Caliban, the man-monster, full of greed and passion and grovelling fear, is at least as near to historic truth as the conception of free and innocent primæval man.

And not only is the sentence, in its common acceptation, historically untrue. Inferences have been drawn from it, doctrines have been built on it, which have been mischievous in practical politics. From the belief in the goodness of human nature, when it is left to itself and unfettered by external conditions, follows the doctrine that "the voice of the people is the voice of God"—one of the most fatal creeds that either a politician or a nation can adopt. It reduces the duty of a statesman to the art of trimming his sails to catch the popular breeze, relieves him of all moral responsibility, makes him a mere follower instead of a leader of men; whilst in a nation it gives the freest play to that "tyranny of majorities" which is at least as bad as any other form of tyranny. Every man who knows himself recognises that he is not wholly good, that he has passions and tendencies that need to be disciplined and controlled; and he must recognise, if he will reflect, that as it is with himself so it is with the nation.

But though no more striking instance of the influence and danger of cries and catchwords could be found than the far-reaching effect upon politics of this famous sentence of Rousseau's, it is more than possible that most of us have unwittingly done an injustice to the memory of its author. Some very convincing evidence on this point is brought together by Mr. Bosanquet in two of the most interesting chapters of his new and valuable work, "The Philosophical Theory of the State."[1] The striking first sentence of the "Contrat Social" has been remembered to the neglect of the sentences that immediately follow it. "How did this change take place? I do not know. What can render it legitimate? I think I can tell." And though Rousseau often uses language elsewhere which, like his first sentence, implies a false theory of an original state of nature, and a fall from it to a state of slavery, yet Mr. Bosanquet shows that he had attained, though dimly and confusedly, to an idea of the use and meaning of civilised society which is both true and fruitful. In chapter viii, "Of the Civil Condition," Rousseau speaks of the passage from the natural state to the civil state, producing in man "a very remarkable change by replacing in his conduct instinct by justice, and giving to his actions the morality which they lacked before." He proceeds:

> Although he deprives himself in this state of several advantages which he holds from nature, he gains such great ones in their place, his faculties exercise and develop themselves, his ideas expand, his sentiments are ennobled, his whole soul is exalted to such a degree that, if the abuses of his new condition did not often degrade him below that from which he has emerged, it would be his duty to bless without ceasing the happy instant which tore him from it for ever, and from a stupid and narrow animal made him an intelligent being and human.

The justification for the use of force by the State against the individual Rousseau finds in "the general will," which he expressly distinguishes from "the will of all." It is not, that is to say, the mere totality of the wills of the separate units; it is what each would will if he kept the higher good, the good of all, in view; it is the real or ideal will of the individuals who compose the State, but not their actual will at any given moment. Having attained this conception, Rousseau speedily loses sight of it, and again confuses "the general will" with "the will of all," by supposing that "the general will" can be ascertained from the voting of the popular assembly. So that there is ample excuse for his followers if they have misunderstood his meaning. But it was, nevertheless, as Mr. Bosanquet says, "no small feat of insight" for one who felt as keenly as he did the injustices of the existing order—"the first perhaps of great modern writers to feel the true democratic passion"—"to subdue his just repugnance so far as to estimate the use, as distinct from the abuse, of law and society."

The doctrine of "the General Will," which Rousseau left in so vague and undeveloped a form, is, when rightly understood, the theory that the individual only finds his proper development when he transcends himself, that the Social Self is higher than the ante- or anti-Social Self. "The State," in the old phrase of Aristotle, "exists for good life"—to help the individuals in it to their full development. And that full development is only attained when the members of the State pass beyond the limits of their own separate lives to some conception of the life of the State as a whole.

Political theories, we are often reminded, follow political facts; the theories do not make the facts, the facts make the theories. This may be admitted to be true, very largely if not altogether, by the believer in this doctrine of the "Social Self." He may indeed point out that his is a theory which proposes to follow and explain existing facts; that the practice of the rest of the world is, on the whole, better than its theories; that in common theory we look upon men as units, each pursuing their own interests, acting upon each other by external impact, acted upon by the State by external compulsion, whereas in practice we transcend these limitations and rise to an idea of what is good for the State as a whole though it may be inconvenient to us personally. But our practice, though already it goes some way in this direction, is capable of indefinite extension along the same lines. And that is the great advantage of the theory: it presents an ideal. Seldom were ideals more needed in English politics than at the present moment. Here is one which statesmen would do well to consider in its bearing on home and foreign politics

[1] "The Philosophical Theory of the State." By Bernard Bosanquet. (London: Macmillan & Co., Limited.)

and especially on the government of India. With its insistence on duties rather than on rights, with its corollary of self-sacrifice for the common good, it would have a wholesomer influence on politics than some ideals that are more popular just now. It would not, like the ideal (or rather the idol) of "the island race", for example, encourage that self-complacency which, next to despair, is the most fatal obstacle to political improvement.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

WHEN I wrote last I explained how the Government had, unintentionally perhaps, but none the less really, put life and "go" into the Liberal party. Since then there has been no lack of signs of the truth of that assertion. The Tories carried the second reading of their Clerical Tithes Bill, commonly called the "Parsons Relief Bill" by a big majority, it is true, but the members who won that "victory" have been cursing their fate and their leaders ever since, while the vanquished Liberals are delighted with the turn events have taken. Never was the old and trite remark that there are some victories more deadly than defeat more thoroughly illustrated. It just happens that there is an election going on in the country which has been furnishing politicians with a very simple test of the reality of the faith the Tories have in their policy of bribing the Church out of the public purse. At Oldham, where there is a double vacancy, their cause is being championed by as curious a couple as were ever unequally yoked together to trot in electoral harness; they are known as the "Scion and the Socialist." One is Mr. Winston Churchill, a son of the late Lord Randolph Churchill, and the other a Mr. Mawdsley, who tries to combine the parts of labour leader and Conservative candidate.

The result has been comical in the extreme. The two have been indulging in mutual compliments of the richest quality. Thus the alleged labour leader has said of the other that he is a scion of our good old aristocracy, while the scion has dubbed his colleague as a wonderfully fine fellow in every respect. But the joke is that when they were asked their views on the Tithes Bill they were both forced to own that had they been in the House they would have voted against it! Thus we have the curious spectacle of a Conservative Government advocating a measure in the House of Commons as based upon the eternal principles of justice, and its champions in the country inviting Conservative voters to send them to the House to vote against it. The men of Lancashire have a reputation for shrewdness. Sometimes I think it is an undeserved, or at least a not entirely deserved, reputation, especially when one remembers how they were hoodwinked at the last general election. But they are sharp enough, I feel sure, to see through such a transparent farce as this.

Mr. Winston Churchill seems to feel his position very acutely. And it is a trying position, as all must admit, for he has to upbraid Mr. George Whiteley for doing that which Mr. Churchill says he would have done had he been in the House. In these circumstances he takes refuge in boyish impudence, a trait he has inherited in no stinted measure from his father, without Lord Randolph's undoubted political genius. Thus, the other day he said that Mr. Whiteley, having found that money would not get him on in the Conservative party, had joined the Radicals, who, according to this aristocratic youth, "have very little money and very little brains." The allusion to money was singularly unfortunate in the light of recent revelations. Liberals have been reminding him of the strange case of Sir William Marriott, who was at one time a Liberal with money and with brains of a sort. Sir William is not one of the most conspicuous figures of the century, but he has done much better among the Tories than he would have done with all his money and his modicum of brains among the Liberals. More striking still than Sir William Marriott is the case of Mr. Terah Hooley. He showed charmingly how useful money, or the reputation of having money, is in the Tory ranks.

I mentioned last week how desperately anxious the Government were to rush their Tithes Bill through. They have since then given another illustration of how firmly they believe in that sound old maxim that the least said is soonest mended. More than once I have predicted in this column that the Conservatives stand to lose both in Lancashire and in London. I have referred to the contest now going on in Lancashire, and now the Government has to face the music in a London constituency also. Last Monday the morning papers announced that Mr. Robert Grant Webster, an eccentric London Tory member sitting for East St. Pancras, had resolved to retire from Parliament. Soon after three o'clock in the afternoon of the same day I heard the Chief Tory Whip in the House of Commons move for a new writ to be issued. I suppose there never was so striking an illustration of the policy of rush. The whole thing will be over in a week! The Tory candidate is Mr. Wrightson, a wealthy magnate from Stockton-on-Tees. He used to sit for that town in the House, but his own people threw him over at the general election. The Liberals have put forward Mr. Costelloe, a man who has done great things for the Progressive cause in the London County Council and on the London School Board. Mr. Costelloe fought East St. Pancras at the last general election, and was beaten, it is true, but 1895 was a year of exceptional and record disaster for Liberalism in London. Yet in that year of gloom Mr. Costelloe reduced the Conservative majority considerably. In the better conditions of to-day he stands to win.

There are those who say that if the Government lose the seats at Oldham and in St. Pancras the disasters, coming so quickly after their reverses in Edinburgh, will give them such a shock that a general election will ensue. I cannot agree with that view of the case at all. One of their most trusted counsellors in everything concerning electioneering is Mr. Chamberlain. I have never regarded Mr. Chamberlain as a statesman, but there is no doubt about his being a very shrewd politician, one of those who excite the scorn of Mr. John Morley by thinking that "politics" and "tactics" are synonymous terms. Now such a man would never dream of going to the country when the prospects look bad. He will argue rather that it is better to wait for something to turn up, to trust to the reaction of public opinion, at any rate to hold on and hope for better things.

Mr. Chamberlain is getting rather d[illegible] just now. He has not scored in the least in his tussel [illegible] grim, sturdy statesman, President Kruger. The Colonial Secretary hates to be made the subject of ridicule and he is being laughed at both here and abroad in connexion with his prolonged failure. Some of his recent speeches have been reckless beyond all description, so that steady-going citizens are beginning to suspect that he would not hesitate to plunge South Africa into all the horrors of a war of races simply out of pique, and with the desire merely to bolster up his waning reputation. But he has not a free hand in the matter. I cannot often praise Lord Salisbury, but in this case I believe his chief failing, I mean his timidity, has stood him in good stead. He will do almost anything, and submit to almost anything, rather than have a war. Moreover there is no doubt that the Queen is anxious, naturally anxious, to avoid having her declining years marred by bloodshed. She is a strenuous advocate of peace, and her influence is enormous, by virtue of her age and character as much as her great position. So while Mr. Chamberlain is allowed to indulge in the luxury of rhetorical flings at Birmingham, he is not allowed the far greater luxury of having his own way—and it is well for this country that he is not.

Meantime he never misses an opportunity of bustling to the front. There has been a futile little measure before the House of Commons known as the Small Houses (Acquisition of Ownership) Bill—a very small instalment of that wonderful social programme of which so much was heard at the general election. On Tuesday night it was read a third time in a House of about a dozen members, and I could not understand at first why Mr. Chamberlain stuck to his place so tenaciously. The mystery was soon solved, for just as the Bill was passing through its last stage he jumped up and made an electioneering speech. Here was a Bill of the greatest importance, he said, by which the Government redeemed one of their chief pledges at the general election. Yet he declared that the Opposition had done nothing to help it forward. He called the attention of the country to this spectacle of the virtuous Government and the wicked Opposition with almost hysterical emphasis. The matter was trivial in itself, yet it struck me as significant, too, for it shows in what straits

the Ministers find themselves when they can clutch at such a straw.

There is another sign, too, of how conscious the Tories are that they are losing hold on the country. I have explained that Mr. Geo. Whiteley, the Tory member for Stockport, has turned against them; he is going to act as an Independent Liberal, to sit with the Liberals and to receive the ordinary official communications from the Liberal Whips. He has placed his resignation in the hands of the Tories in his constituency, and what does the reader suppose is the step they have taken? They have asked him not to resign and have given him leave to act as he likes for the rest of this Parliament. The explanation is simple—they dare not face the music of a contest, and that is the general attitude of the great Tory party just now. Like other sinners, they think that their present condition is better than their future state is likely to be.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, June 29.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer and Mr. Chamberlain received a deputation representing the directors of the Eastern and Eastern Extension Telegraph Companies on the subject of an all-British cable. The deputation protested against the reported intention of the Government to join Canada and Australia in direct and active competition with the cable companies. Sir M. Hicks-Beach promised a written reply. He expressed surprise that their objections had not been presented long ago. He saw no reason why the Government should not assist in the establishment of a Pacific cable, and the deputation's contention that they were entitled to compensation in such an event was unjustifiable. Nor did he see what right they had to complain of any competition which might arise. The alternative route *via* the Cape fell through because of the refusal of India and the Australian Governments to help. Mr. Chamberlain commented upon the policy of the companies in using their profits to increase their monopoly instead of reducing rates, and spoke of the importance of an all-British route. The companies need not fear undue competition by the Government.

At the Peace Conference the Russian proposal for the lim[illegible]aments, both naval and military, was declared to [illegible]un[illegible]ceptable. The *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent at [illegible] Hague anticipated no immediate result on the question of a standstill of armaments, and said it was clear that England and Russia were the only two great Powers represented at the Hague which would entertain any proposal for an arrest of naval means of defence.

The Victorian Federal Assembly passed the Federal Enabling Bill.

A telegram from Pekin stated that the affair arising out of the murder of the British missionary, Mr. Fleming, in Kwei-chau seemed likely to lead to serious complications, Mr. Bax-Ironside's efforts to obtain redress having proved ineffectual.

FRIDAY, June 30.—In the Commons, during the discussion on the Irish Estimates, there was a lively debate on the refusal of the Government to allow Nationalist historians to inspect certain State documents in Dublin Castle, though Unionist historians were permitted to do so.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman dined at the City Liberal Club. Dealing with the Transvaal question, he repeated his former declaration that for his part he could see nothing whatever in all that had occurred "to justify either warlike action or military preparation." He declared his dislike of the word "Imperialism," which might cover the wildest folly, and his belief that the bulk of his fellow citizens, while determined to meet all the responsibilities undertaken, had no liking for new enterprises, for the most part visionary. He condemned the Clergy Relief Bill.

In Belgium the Government, after several days' riots, repressed with great severity, found themselves obliged to announce to the Chamber their desire for conciliation. It was believed that the Electoral Bill, to which the Liberals and Socialists objected so strongly, would be withdrawn or modified.

A free fight occurred in the Italian Chamber which lasted ten minutes and in which the minority were said to have routed the majority. As a result of this, the King decided, in defiance of the Constitution, to suspend the sittings of the Chamber and promulgate a Coercion Bill by royal edict.

SATURDAY, July 1.—It was announced at Washington that a reciprocity treaty had been arranged between the United States and Jamaica and forwarded to Kingston for the approval of the colonial authorities.

Dominion Day, the anniversary of the birth of the Canadian Confederation, was celebrated throughout the Dominion, and a commemorative banquet was held in London. It was stated in New York that a new deadlock had occurred on the Alaska Boundary question, and it was generally believed that Canada did not desire any agreement.

Two Chinamen, after a three days' trial at Hong Kong, were convicted of murdering a man named Chintung, who had been sent to placard at Unloong, in the Hinterland, the Governor's proclamation of the British occupation of the Kowloon Extension. Judgment was reserved.

Captain Dreyfus landed at Quiberon, in Brittany, very early in the morning, and was conveyed by special train to Rennes, where he was placed in the military prison. Later on, his wife visited him there.

The deputation, representing 800 of the most eminent men of science and letters in Europe, which had come to St. Petersburg to present addresses to the Czar urging the claims of Finland, was refused a hearing. It was said that these addresses would be placed with the rejected monster petition of the Finns in the archives at Helsingfors in Finland.

Mr. R. G. Webster, Conservative Member for East St. Pancras (London), announced his resignation for private reasons.

MONDAY, July 3.—The House of Commons went into Committee on the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal to buy up the rights of the Niger Company for £865,000 and transfer the administration of their territories to the Crown. The resolution after considerable opposition was carried by 216 votes to 116. Afterwards, in the debate on the Military Works Bill, Lord Charles Beresford declared that while Wei-hai-Wei was useless under the old policy of the Government, that of maintaining the integrity of China, it was "a positive danger" under the new policy of creating spheres of influence.

The Diet of Coburg adopted a Bill by which the Duke of Albany becomes heir to the Duchy, the Duke of Connaught and his son Prince Arthur having resigned their claims, the first absolutely and the second except in the event of the failure of the Duke of Albany's male line. Should the male line of both the Dukes of Albany and Connaught fail, the succession would pass to the line of the Prince of Wales.

President Kruger at the opening of the Raad declared that the burghers were "as firm as a rock" on the question of independence.

TUESDAY, July 4.—The Duke and Duchess of York opened a new wing of the Albert Memorial Museum at Exeter, and paid a visit to the Cathedral and the Hospital.

The International Congress of Women concluded its prolonged and successful sittings.

Mr. George Whiteley, M.P. for Stockport, intimated that he should withdraw his resignation, and that in future he would "act generally" with the Liberal party. Thus a by-election was avoided.

The Uitlanders' Council at Johannesburg issued a declaration in favour of Sir A. Milner's scheme of reform as "calculated to lead to a practical and permanent settlement." They asked for conditions under which persons should become enfranchised without unnecessary expense or possible intimidation, an automatic redistribution of seats, and a guaranteed understanding between the two Government providing for immediate changes in the present laws. They desired that no disability should arise through creed, that English should have an equality with Dutch as the official language, freedom of public meeting and of the press, personal security, the abolition of monopolies, local government for towns with over 1,000 population, a State system of education, and the reorganisation of the Civil Service.

The Arbitration Examination Committee of the Peace Conference concluded the second reading of the arbitration project as a whole. One of the German delegates stated that he had been instructed not to accept the principle of obligatory arbitration otherwise than by special conventions. This led to Article 10 of the Russian proposal, enumerating cases in which arbitration should be obligatory, being struck out and replaced by a provision declaring that arbitration should be optional except in the case of conventions effected before or after the ratification of arbitration by the Powers.

The Tsar published a rescript to the Governor-General of Finland defending the Russian action as regards Finland and declaring that the Finnish estates had misapprehended it in various points.

A Pekin telegram stated that Lord Salisbury had withdrawn the demand for the recall of the Governor of Kwei-Chau on account of the murder of Mr. Fleming, the missionary, provided the headman concerned be captured and punished.

WEDNESDAY, July 5.—The Prince of Wales opened the show of the Highland and Agricultural Society, and presided successively at meetings of the Highland Society, the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, and the Scottish Agricultural Benevolent Institution. In an address at one of the meetings he said he had been engaged for many years in farming operations, and he was glad to be told that the farmers looked upon him as their warm friend. He regretted to learn that the prospects of the season were not altogether satisfactory in some respects in that part of the kingdom.

A large and enthusiastic meeting was held in London to protest against the action of the House of Lords whereby

women are deprived of the right to become members of the new municipal bodies in the capital.

The Archbishops and Bishops dined with the Lord Mayor at the Mansion House. The Archbishop of Canterbury appealed for patience on the part of those that expected the Bishops to allay the anxiety arising from the crisis in the Church.

The University of London, at a meeting of the Senate, accepted the proposal of the Government "so far as it provides in the buildings of the Imperial Institute accommodation for the work hitherto done by the University."

Lord Spencer, speaking at Cambridge, paid a tribute to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's leadership of the Liberal party, whose prospects he regarded as favourable. He adhered to the policy of Home Rule, but thought it could not expect the first place in a Liberal Ministerial programme.

Lord George Hamilton, at Chiswick, defended the South African policy of the Government, and hoped that the practical unanimity of the country would lead the South African Republic to a policy of conciliation.

Messrs. Hofmeyr and Herholdt arrived at Pretoria, and in conjunction with Mr. Fischer, of the Orange Free State, they met the President and the whole of the Executive, when a discussion of the franchise proposals took place. No official declaration as to the result of the conference was made, but according to a Press Association special telegram from Pretoria a very hopeful feeling prevailed, and the correspondent learned that "fair and reasonable amendments will be made in President Kruger's Bloemfontein memorandum," so as to "bring it more into consonance with Mr. Fischer's original proposals." There were indications of a marked inclination in various quarters to grant a liberal franchise, and it was considered that there was no reasonable doubt that peace would be preserved.

The correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* at the Hague reported that matters had taken an excellent turn on the question of arbitration. The project had undergone considerable modifications, but a clause imposing upon the signatory Powers the duty of summoning disputants to use the tribunal established at the Hague was unanimously adopted.

The Victorian Government offered a referendum, if such were desired, upon the question of including unsectarian religious teaching in the State system of education.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, June 17.

To-day's morning papers contain a telegraphic summary of the result of the debate on the motion of Sir Henry Fowler. The result was of course fully anticipated here, and therefore creates no surprise. It was taken for granted that the division would give a thumping majority to the Ministry. The details of the debate as well as of the division will no doubt be known here two weeks hence. But judging from Reuter's far from adequate summary it does not appear that the Secretary of State did remarkably well in defence of that piece of hasty and interested legislation. His utterances, so far as telegraphed, would seem to show that he indulged with no little wearisomeness in those stock platitudes which are always in his mouth. He appears to have talked high falutin about establishing the confidence of the people, maintaining peace, and promoting the material welfare of the country. These sentiments coming from the mouth of one who during his three years' reactionary administration of this country has done absolutely nothing towards the objects which he so magniloquently talked about on the occasion are indeed very amusing. Surely Lord George does not wish to convey to the people of India that he was not the Secretary of State who did his worst to achieve the very opposite of fostering and stimulating confidence. Was not he the State Secretary who ordered the arrest of the Natus and who has given three different versions of the reason of their detention? Is he not the Lord George Hamilton who, after holding himself responsible for the detention of the unfortunate Sirdars, only told us the other day that it was left with the Bombay Government to release them? Again, is he not the same Secretary of State whose "mandate" led to that odious Press law which is a hundred times worse than the Gagging Act of 1876, which the liberal statesmanship of Mr. Gladstone repealed four years later on? Is he not, again, the author of a variety of administrative rulings of a most reactionary character? Is he not aware that all these acts, great and small, have inspired the greatest distrust, rather than confidence in the honesty and justice of British rule in India? Is he not aware that he is the prime originator of all the unrest prevailing in India—unrest wrought by his policy of repression and retrogression?

Then, again, Lord George Hamilton had the audacity to declare in the Commons that sugar-cane cultivation was the "backbone of agriculture in north-western India." This is what the telegram says. If it be true, what are the Indian people to say of his knowledge of Indian statistics? For what are the facts? The backbone of agriculture in northern India is not sugar-cane, but wheat primarily; then come rice and other cereals. The average acreage under crops, non-food and food, aggregates four crores of acres in the North-West Provinces and Oudh, while that of sugar-cane is only twelve lakhs—say, three per cent. only! What an insignificant acreage!—and yet the State Secretary, in face of these irrefragable statistics, had the audacity coolly to inform members of the House of Commons that sugar-cane cultivation was the backbone of agriculture in those provinces! This is the way in which a responsible Minister of the Crown misleads Parliament and the ignorant British public outside it. It is to be hoped some member has traversed his lordship's fallacious statistics and also laid bare the contents of that precious Mauritius memorial of 8,000 persons. For no document reveals more clearly the absence of scruple in this sugar agitation and the method and manner in which it was arranged in consultation with the two interested Indian Chambers of Commerce.

Among other items of news may be mentioned the new Agricultural Bill for the Punjab, which is to be soon brought before the Legislative Council at Simla. Its object is to check the evil of the land of the peasant passing into the hands of the middleman or the sowcar. Its main feature, therefore, is the creation of a jubilee every fifteen years, when all mortgaged land should be returned to the original owners.

There have been very serious and bloody riots in Southern India between two communities who are in deadly opposition to each other. They have originated in race feuds between Maravars and Shanars. The latter are a low caste people who, however, are awaking to intelligence. The situation is threatening; but there is no political significance in the incident.

Next there is the prosecution now going on against the *Gouraki*, a miserable daily rag printed and published in Bombay and sold at a pice—say a farthing. The charge is based on a series of articles of a wildly seditious nature more or less in imitation of the writings of the *Kal*. The paper is of no importance whatever.

The railway signallers' strike continues. The Railway Company is very obdurate and refuses to accept arbitration. On the other hand the signallers are equally firm. The Native press unanimously recommend arbitration, and aver that it is most unfair to allow this Company, which is guaranteed by the taxpayers, to fight, with the taxpayers' monies, against a class of helpless and poor workers, men who have for ten long years been plying their suit for increased wages, but who have found no redress, and who till lately bore their hard lot with Job-like patience. Meanwhile great inconvenience is felt by passengers inland; but very little of what happens at out stations is allowed to be known.

It is reported from Simla that the salaries and pensions of our judges of the High Courts are to be increased. The higher emoluments will not be grudged *provided competent judges* are selected; for some of the recent appointments to Indian High Courts are far from satisfactory. One of the late appointments on the bench of the High Court has been the subject of no little hostile criticism among the bar.

India is rejoiced at the magnificent success of Raghunath Purushottam Paranjpye, as Senior Wrangler. Here is another proof of the capacity of the Indian intellect to compete with any European mind, provided it be allowed free scope. India is indeed honoured by the honour Mr. Paranjpye has been able to achieve by sheer force of his intellectual powers. And he owes a great deal to his Indian College—Fergusson—which is one of the best academic institutions in India carried on by purely Indian educational enterprise.

THE HIGH COURT JUDGES.

The following statement has just been communicated by the India Office to the English Press:—

"The question of improving the position of the Judges of the several High Courts in India has recently been engaging the attention of the Secretary of State for India in Council, and on April 27 last he addressed a dispatch to the Government of India informing them that the following changes had been decided upon:—

"In future the salary of a Puisne Judge of a High Court in India will be Rs. 48,000 instead of Rs. 45,000 per annum. The salaries of the Chief Justices, however, remain unchanged, viz., Rs. 72,000 per annum for the Chief Justice of Bengal, and Rs. 60,000 per annum for the Chief Justices of Madras, Bombay, and the North-Western Provinces.

"Every Chief Justice or Judge appointed to a High Court in India will be called upon to resign his office on attaining the age of sixty years.

"The pensions will remain as at present, viz., £1,800 per annum for the Chief Justice of Bengal, £1,500 per annum for the Chief Justices of the other three High Courts, and £1,200 per annum for Puisne Judges. But the period of actual service required by a Chief Justice or a Puisne Judge for earning his pension has been reduced from 14½ to 11½ years. If at any time after 6¾ years' service, but before he has served for 11½ years, a Judge is compelled to retire through ill-health, he will receive half the pension which he would have received if he had completed his full term of office."

THE INDIAN SENIOR WRANGLER.

"WARMEST CONGRATULATIONS" FROM FERGUSSON COLLEGE, POONA.

On the evening of June 13, when the news of Mr. Paranjpye's success reached Poona, a congratulatory message was telegraphed to him by the resident students of Fergusson College. Next day a general meeting of the college students was held under the presidency of Principal Gole, who was supported by the whole professorate and by a very full muster of life members; and the accompanying Address was unanimously adopted:—

To Raghunath Purushottam Paranjpye, Esq.,
B.Sc. (Bom.), B.A. (Cantab.), Senior Wrangler, 1899.

Sir,—We, the Fellows and Students of the Fergusson College, Poona, crave leave to offer you our warmest congratulations on the signal and most wonderful success which you have achieved. You are the first Indian to attain the position of a Senior Wrangler, and the whole country has naturally reason to be proud of you. But what enhances the value of your achievement in our eyes is the fact that you are an old student of this College and that you have already decided to give the best work of which you are capable to this institution. This combination of the highest intellectual attainments with a magnificent spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to your old College is perfectly unique, and it illustrates to what heights the Indian character is still capable of attaining. We feel that your success is our success, and that we are all raised in you. The elevating example which your life affords will be a standing source of high inspiration to your countrymen. It will indeed be a proud day for this College when you come back and occupy the place which you have already marked out for yourself in it. May you have health and happiness, and may your future be a worthy continuation of the glorious record which you have established for yourself, is the fervent prayer of

Your loving friends and pupils,
(*Signatures follow*).

HOW RANJITSINHJI LOST A KINGDOM.

[From the "Pioneer."]

For the thousands who are mustering at every great cricket match in England now that the pleasant days of June are round again, there will be no greater gratification once more than a big innings by "the Indian Prince." Ranjitsinhji's absence from England last year left a distinct void in the breasts of cricket-goers, and the accounts of his reception at the opening match of the season against the Australians at the Crystal Palace show how warmly he is welcomed back. Yet of the scores and hundreds of people who are perfectly acquainted with his averages and centuries, very few, it may be suspected, have any knowledge of his genealogy; and even in India most of us probably remember no more than that he comes of a ruling family in Kathiawar, and is, or was, a claimant to one of the States in that province.

The story of Ranjitsinhji's position is in fact rather long and complicated, but it is interesting enough to be worth recapitulating in view of the present celebrity of the principal figure. To get to the beginning of it, we have to go back to the early fifties, when Vibhaji, the late Jam of Jamnagar, succeeded to the *gadi* of that State. In 1856 this ruler, who had already taken to himself Rajput wives of his own race, contracted a matrimonial alliance with three Mahometan sisters. In the course of the following year, the eldest of these ladies gave birth to a son who was named Kaloji, shortly called Kaloobhai. This son was in 1870, on the representation of the Jam, recognised by the British Government as heir to the Jamnagar *gadi*. Kaloobhai married when about the age of 17, and has issue, a son, Lokhoji, born about 1875, who is in Europe at present. About 1877, on the interposition of the Jam, Kaloobhai was deposed from his position as heir on the alleged ground of conspiring against the life of the Jam. Kaloobhai was not only disinherited, but was expelled the State and sent to Ahmednagar, where he still remains as a *détenu* in the fort. His reason is said to be impaired. Kaloobhai has a sister who is still living in Jamnagar, and is in the enjoyment of her deceased mother's estate.

On Kaloobhai's deposition the Jam adopted another infant, but this lad died two years later. Then in 1880 the Jam made a fresh adoption of none less than the youth Ranjitsinhji, who is descended from another line of Jams; but whose family had been under a cloud on the suspicion of being implicated in the murder of one of the Jams. Ranjitsinhji, now the recognised heir, was sent to the Rajkoomar College for his education. In 1882, however, one of the surviving sisters of the three Mahometan wives, already referred to, gave birth to a son (the present Jam), and the Jam applied to the Government to sanction his setting aside the adoption, as heir, of Ranjitsinhji, and asked that this son should be recognised as his heir, at the same time urging that the adoption had been conditional on his having no male issue by any of his wives. The Government of India at first rejected this application, contending that in the terms of the adoption it was conditional on an heir being born by any of his Rajput wives; but as in the original agreement drawn up between Sir James Peile, the then Political Agent, and the Jam, the nationality of the wife was not specified, the Government complied with the request, and the boy was recognised as the heir. On the death of the late Jam in 1895, the youth was accordingly installed in his stead. Though he has just completed his education at the Rajkoomar College, the State is still being administered by Colonel Kennedy in his capacity as guardian to the young prince.

Ranjitsinhji, though set aside from the succession, enjoys an allowance of Rs. 10,000 per annum from the State, and as all know was sent to England to complete his education. Thus, by the mere omission of the word "Rajput" in designating the Jam's wives in the rough and original copy of the agreement of the adoption, and though in the copy drawn up for transmission to government the term is interpolated, Ranjitsinhji has lost a kingdom. On the other hand, England has gained a cricketer. And if fortune has been hard on Ranjitsinhji in the matter of substantial possessions, at all events she has made it up to him in the way of celebrity, as she does not do to everybody who misses inheritance.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, June 29.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

East India (Railways).—Copy presented—of Administration Report on the Railways in India for 1898-9, by A. Brereton, Esq., Director of Railway Traffic and Statistics [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Financial Statement, 1899—1900).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address May 19; Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254.]

MAHOMETAN PILGRIMAGES.

Mr. MacNeill asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he would communicate to the House copies of the Notes which had been addressed to the Porte by her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, demanding pecuniary compensation on behalf of Mahometan British subjects who had been outraged between Jeddah and the cities of Mecca and Medina when performing religious duties in the Hedjaz;

And whether, as seven years had elapsed since the attention of the Porte was called to the inability of the Governor-General of Turkish Arabia to protect pilgrims from murder, outrage, and plunder, her Majesty's Government would now join the Government of the Netherlands in making renewed representations to his Imperial Majesty the Sultan on the subject of the safe conduct of British and Dutch subjects whilst travelling on the highways and turnpike roads in Arabia on a visit to the Mahometan shrines.

Mr. Brodrick: It is true that in 1892 her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople represented strongly to the Porte the need of measures to prevent attacks by Bedouins on British Indian pilgrims, and orders were then issued for their adoption. But further representations have been made since then on the insecurity of the Mecca and Medina roads. In October, 1896, Sir P. Currie sent a Note to the Porte on the subject. Again, in February of this year, Sir N. O'Conor called their attention to robberies committed in the Hedjaz between 1892 and 1898, and presented a Note Verbale on the claims of British Indian subjects for compensation.

I shall be happy to show these Notes, if desired, to the hon. member, but do not propose to lay them on the Table of the House.

Friday, June 30.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EARNINGS OF INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would state what had been the falling off in the gross earnings of the Indian railways since April 1, the beginning of the present financial year:

And, whether such reductions would affect the General Budget Estimate of 1899-1900, to be considered by the House at a later stage of the Session.

Lord G. Hamilton: The gross earnings of the Indian railways, from April 1 to May 20, 1899, were Rx. 4,094,030, or less by Rx. 441,192 than the earnings in the corresponding period of 1898, which were unusually large.

The prospect of the Railway Revenue Account will of course form one point for consideration in the discussion that will take place on the Financial Statement for the current year.

TRANSFRONTIER JURISDICTION.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the notification recently issued from the Political Department of the Government of India, purporting to extend jurisdiction, under the Indian Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code, to a tract of country bordered on the east by the Dera Ismail Khan district, and on the west by the Bargha Sherani country:

Whether this region was beyond the frontiers of her Majesty's Indian possessions; and, if so, whether he would state under whose

authority, and by what statutory sanction, does the jurisdiction of the Indian Government purport to be established on such Foreign territory:

And, whether he would state whether any civil or military officers of the Indian Government were stationed in that tract; and, if so, when and how would the consent of Parliament be asked, as required by the Act of 1858, to sanction the consequent expenditure of Indian revenues beyond the frontiers.

Lord G. HAMILTON: (1) I am aware that a Notification under the Indian Foreign Jurisdiction Act has been issued in respect of the Bargha Sherani country.

(2) The country lies outside the administrative borders of the Punjab, but inside the frontier of her Majesty's Indian possessions. As her Majesty has Foreign jurisdiction in the tract, action has been legally taken under the Indian Foreign Jurisdiction Act.

(3) A Native extra Assistant-Commissioner is stationed in the tract, and no action under the Act of 1858 is required.

GUARANTEED AND SUBSIDISED RAILWAYS.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would state what amount was during the second portion of the year of 1898 provided out of current Indian revenues to make up the difference between the net earnings of the guaranteed and subsidised Indian railways for that period and the amount required for interest and dividends under contract:

And, whether he would present a statement showing the sums paid during the period referred to out of State revenues to the several railway companies, together with any sums which might have accrued to the public revenues from railways the net earnings of which exceeded the guaranteed interest during the same period.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government accounts are not prepared according to the calendar year. I have no objection to have a statement prepared from the accounts of the several Indian Railway Companies, to show, with as much accuracy as practicable, the position of the Government in respect of the Guaranteed and Subsidised Companies in the two half-years of 1898. To take the second half-year alone would be misleading.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE.

Mr. JAMES STUART asked the Secretary of State for India, if he would lay upon the Table a Copy of the Circular issued from Simla on June 18, 1898, for the purpose of ascertaining from the various medical schools whether female hospital assistants could be obtained to engage in the examination of prostitutes in India:

And, if he would state the result of the enquiry, how many of such hospital assistants had consented to perform these examinations, and on what terms they had been engaged.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have seen no copy of the circular in question, but I will make enquiries on the subject.

Monday, July 3.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

East India (Indian Currency Committee, 1898),—Copy presented of Index and Appendices to the evidence taken before the Committee appointed to enquire into the Indian Currency [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

MEMORIALS FROM KHARIAR ZEMINDARS.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India would he explain why no reply had yet been given by the Government of India in reference to the memorials presented by Lal Brijraj Sinh and other zemindars of Khariar, in the district of Raipur, praying for redress of grievances:

And whether, in view of the long delay which had taken place, he would cause immediate enquiry to be made into the matter.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am informed by the Government of India that orders on their memorial were communicated to the Khariar and other zemindars of Raipur on the 14th of last month.

Tuesday, July 4.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SPECIAL TERMS OF PENSION.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his despatch approving of special terms of retirement for certain service officers of the Indian Public Works Department from Cooper's Hill had yet arrived in India:

And, whether he would arrange for its simultaneous publication in this country and in India.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The despatch of the Secretary of State has been in the hands of the Government of India for some days, and doubtless the officers who are eligible for the special terms of pension sanctioned in that despatch have been communicated with.

The Government of India do not propose to publish the terms sanctioned by the Secretary of State.

Thursday, July 6.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PATHAN CRIMES ON THE FRONTIER.

Mr. HEDDERWICK asked the Secretary of State for India, whether at Peshawar, in March of this year, Colonel Le Marchant, of the Hampshire Regiment, was assassinated, and in April three sentries of the Royal Scots Fusiliers cut off by Pathans:

Whether at Cherat, in May of this year, a sergeant was severely wounded by two Pathans and his rifle stolen, and a drummer of the Hampshire Regiment cut off, while strolling outside the camp, and stabbed:

Whether in respect of these crimes any reprisals or punishments had been inflicted upon the Pathans:

And, what steps the Government were taking to put a stop to the constant attempts of the Natives to murder and rob of their arms British soldiers on the Punjab frontier.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Although I have not received detailed reports of each of the incidents mentioned in the first and second questions, I have no reason to doubt their accuracy.

In the case of the murderers of Colonel le Marchant and the bandsman the punishment of death has been inflicted on the guilty persons. I await information as to the punishments awarded in the other cases.

In reply to the last part of the question I may state that a partial disarmament in the districts of Peshawar, Hazara, and Kohat has been effected as an experimental measure, and if this proves to be ineffectual a total disarmament will be enforced.

BRITISH CONSULAR SERVICE IN CHINA.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India, whether a sum of £12,500 a year was paid by India to this country for the British Consular Service in China:

And, on what grounds, in the case of the Vice-Consulate at Momien in China, India had been called on to pay half the expenses of that establishment.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The present arrangement under which India pays £12,500 towards the cost of the British Diplomatic and Consular Service in China, and which is subject to reconsideration after March 31 next, was made in 1890. But under the 13th Article of the Burma-China Convention of 1894 it became necessary to provide for a new Consular officer at Manwyne; and since the appointment was in a great measure made in the interests of India, and especially of Indian trade with Bhamo, the Government of India in 1896 accepted the principle of joint liability, with the express understanding that, if Momieb was preferred to Manwyne for the Consul's residence, the liability would continue.

MADRAS COURT OF WARDS AMENDMENT ACT.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been directed to the Madras Court of Wards Amendment Act, 1899, passed on June 9 by the Madras Legislative Council, by which the Court of Wards was empowered to take charge of the estates of bankrupt zemindars, manage their estates officially, and eventually, when cleared of debt, hand them back to the original proprietors:

And whether, before sanctioning this legislation, he would make enquiry as to the grounds on which this alteration in the laws relating to bankruptcy was made, and one class of proprietors treated differently in the event of insolvency from the vast mass of Indian proprietors.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I have not yet received a copy of the Act referred to in its final form, and can therefore give no undertaking on the subject. But I may say that, so far as my knowledge goes, I do not admit the accuracy of the description of it contained in the question. I believe that it applies only to the estates of persons who, by reason of age, or sex, or otherwise, are incapable of managing their affairs, and not to the whole class of zemindars, nor to any estates which are so encumbered by debt as to be incapable of restoration by proper management. I also believe that legislation on the lines of this Act is in accordance with the customs and wishes of the people.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following questions:—

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE: To ask the Secretary of State for India, if the court of enquiry, instituted by the Government of India in respect of the outrage committed by certain soldiers of the West Kent Regiment on a Burmese woman at Rangoon, has made its report; and, if so, will he state the same to the House:

And, if there is any intention to remove the West Kent Regiment from Burma, in order to allay the irritation which prevails there against it. [*Monday, July* 10.]

Mr. PICKERSGILL: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether Sir Charles Paul, the Advocate-General of Bengal, is at present in Europe:

What is the period of his leave of absence from India:

Whether anyone has been appointed to discharge the duties of the office, some of which are of a quasi-judicial character, during his absence; and in particular to whom can a person erroneously convicted apply for a certificate that there was error in the decision in point of law, as provided by section 25 of the Letters Patent of 1865:

And who is empowered, in a case tried by a High Court, to enter a *nolle prosequi*, in pursuance of section 333 of the Criminal Procedure Code. [*Tuesday, July* 11.]

NOTICE OF MOTION.

The following notice of Motion appears on the Order Paper of the House of Commons:—

On going into Committee on East India Revenue Accounts:—

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: To move, That under the existing procedure the superintending authority of Parliament over Indian affairs is not effectively exercised; that the salary of the Secretary of State for India should be placed on the Estimates; that the debate on the Indian Budget should be appointed for an earlier day in the Session; and that with a view to the more effectual discharge by this House of its existing duty to the unrepresented Indian taxpayer, the East India Accounts should each year be referred to a Select Committee with instructions to report on any special features deserving the attention of the House. [An early day.]

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.

FOR CASH OR HIRE.

Machines Exchanged and Repaired.

DUPLICATE PARTS, NEEDLES, OIL, &c., ALWAYS IN STOCK.

100 Offices in India, Burma, and Ceylon.

Instructions Free. *Price Lists Free on application.*

The SINGER Manufacturing Co. } 5, CHURCH GATE ST., BOMBAY.

MAHA-BHARATA,

Condensed into English Verse by ROMESH DUTT, C.I.E.

Cheap Edition (*Temple Classics Series*) Cloth, 1s. 6d., Leather, 2s.

Edition de Luxe, with an Introduction by the RIGHT HON. PROFESSOR MAX MULLER, and 12 Photogravures from Indian Sources by MISS E. S. HARDY, Cloth 12s. 6d., Parchment 15s. PUBLISHERS, DENT & CO., LONDON.

May be had in India through any Indian bookseller.

OPINIONS.

"The impression which his bold undertaking leaves on the reader is certainly that something like what we here read in English may have been recited in India when the war between the Kurus and the sons of Pandu was first sung by the ancient bards of the country."
Prof. Max Muller's Introduction.

"Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt is the first scholar who brings to his task a life-long study of the original, with a perfect command of our own language. . . . Puts into vigorous verse the episodes which are still recited in thousands of quiet hamlets, and hundreds of crowded festivals."—*The Times.*

"An interesting Epilogue by the translator further explains the history and scope of the work, and furnishes an instance of the marvellous command of English acquired by educated Bengali gentlemen. The wisdom of the East is worthily presented in attractive binding and printing."—*The Saturday Review.*

"If the Epic could not attract European readers by its intrinsic merits—its noble moral conceptions, its encyclopædic pictures of Indian civilisation in the remote past, its pathos, its delineation of character—still its extraordinary popularity and influence, as described in the translator's eloquent 'Epilogue,' should alone make us curious to learn something of the story of the Kurus and the God-like sons of Pandu."—*The Manchester Guardian.*

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

Vol. I.—To Concentration of Army on Frontier.

SECOND AFGHAN WAR.

1878-79-80.

By Colonel H. B. HANNA,

Formerly in Punjab Frontier Force and late Commanding at Delhi, Author of "Indian Problems," etc.

PALL MALL GAZETTE.—"Colonel Hanna's tremendous care, completeness and clearness, with his intense conviction, make him a very powerful writer."

ATHENÆUM.—"The ability with which his case is presented is considerable and it is probable that in his main line his view is a well founded one."

MORNING LEADER.—"Colonel Hanna is peculiarly well fitted to handle the multiplicity of questions—political, military, and social—that arise in connection with the Second Afghan War."

A. CONSTABLE, 2, WHITEHALL GARDENS, LONDON.

Price, Net—10s.

Congress Addresses and Resolutions from the first to 1898.

INDIAN POLITICS.

With an Introduction by W. C. BONNERJEE, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.

Price in India, Rs. 2; in England, 4s. (postage 4d. extra).

PART I.—Original Articles.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS. EARDLEY NORTON, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
ECONOMIC CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA. RAO BAHADUR R. N. MUDHOLKAR, B.A., LL.B.
INDIAN ASPIRATIONS UNDER BRITISH RULE. ROMESH CHUNDER DUTT, Esq., C.I.E.
INDIA AND THE CURRENCY QUESTION. DADABHAI NAOROJI, Esq.
THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT QUESTION. JOHN ADAM, Esq., M.A., Bar.-at-Law.
THE POVERTY OF INDIA. ALFRED NUNDY, Esq., Bar.-at-Law.
LINES OF LEGISLATION IN INDIA. P. S. SIVASWAMY AIYAR, Esq., B.A., B.L.
THE JURY SYSTEM IN INDIA. SORAB PESTONJI N. WADIA, Esq.,
THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA. V. KRISHNASWAMI AIYAR, Esq., B.A., B.I.
THE STATUS OF INDIANS ABROAD. G. PARAMESWARAN PILLAY, Esq., B.A.
RAILWAYS IN INDIA. G. SUBRAMANIA AIYAR, Esq., B.A.

PART II.—All the past 13 Congress Presidential Addresses.

PART III.—All the past Congress Resolutions.

In India—Apply to G. A. NATESAN & Co., Publishers, ESPLANADE, MADRAS.
In Great Britain—Apply to The Manager of "INDIA,"
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.
Remittances must accompany order.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know
North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I ave much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.